

Reply to the comment by D. Gorokhov cond-mat/0502083

E. Babaev

*Laboratory for Atomic and Solid State Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-2501, USA
Department of Physics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway*

We show that the recent comment by D. Gorokhov, is based on physically obvious errors and misunderstandings of the content of the criticized papers and is readily refuted. We show that 1) In our paper [1] there were considered situations of both strong and weak interband coupling regimes. 2) In the ref [1] it was given a wide range of physical systems with Josephson coupling strength ranging from very strong to being exactly zero on symmetry grounds. 3) While the ref [1] is not a phenomenological study of MgB_2 , the moderately strong Josephson coupling results of [1] apply to MgB_2 : the described in [1] double-core vortices have been recently observed in MgB_2 .

The first remark we would like to make is that the Comment is unfortunately based on a misunderstanding of a point which was stressed in all our papers: that in two-band superconductors $U(1) \times U(1)$ symmetry is *strictly* forbidden because condensates are not independently conserved and are coupled by Josephson term. The BKT *transition* of the type discussed in [1, 2] could not exist in principle in two-band superconductors. Specific systems with a true $U(1) \times U(1)$ symmetry (i.e. without Josephson coupling) were proposed in [1, 2]. A different story is indeed a possibility of occurrence in Josephson coupled systems of finite size BKT-like *crossovers* (a study announced in [1] as the second paper in ref. [18]), we shall remark on it below.

Another misunderstanding on which the comment is based is an assumption that even parts of the paper dealing with $U(1) \times U(1)$ symmetry and zero Josephson term were devoted to MgB_2 . In [1] we considered all general situations ranging from condensates with strong interband coupling to multicomponent condensates where interband Josephson coupling is forbidden. The paper [1] was not in any respect a phenomenological study of MgB_2 , (MgB_2 was listed among many other examples of weakly and strongly coupled two-gap superconductors) however the moderate Josephson-coupling results in [1] are indeed relevant for MgB_2 . In particular double-core integer flux vortices (a linearly bound state of two co-centered fractional vortices, i.e. type-“(ii)” described on the page 3 of [1]) were indeed observed in MgB_2 [4]. Therefore the potential applicability of the results of [1] to MgB_2 mentioned in the abstract turned out to be correct. When we considered zero or weak Josephson coupling limits in [1, 2] we listed the systems where it is the case like projected superconducting states of light atoms under extreme pressure, certain states of spin-triplet superconductors as well as Josephson-suppressed bilayer systems.

The technical side of the Comment is a substitution of the well known numbers characterizing interband Josephson coupling from ref. [7] to the equations in [1], all the equations in the comment can be found in [1] but simply in a different notation. Therefore nothing new in this

respect is revealed. That is, in particular Gorokhov asserts: **(A)**. ‘finite coupling $g \neq 0$ generates a new length scale Λ ; for $R \gtrsim \Lambda$ vortex–anti-vortex pairs attract with a potential linear in R and thus exhibit confinement, i.e., the BKT-transition is quenched.’ **(B)**. ‘However, if Λ is much larger than the vortex core size, a BKT-like crossover smeared on the scale Λ can still be observed’, **Response for A)**: The “linear” interaction of Josephson vortices has indeed been discussed in [1]: the length scale Λ has been also discussed but merely in different notations being called “the inverse mass for n_1 component of the unit vector $\vec{n}$ ”. The fact that in the presence of the Josephson effect we have sine-Gordon vortices is discussed in detail in the paper (e.g. second page, left column). In particular it was written on the large Josephson coupling limit: ... *the energy per unit length of noncomposite vortices is divergent in an infinite sample both in cases of zero and nonzero Josephson coupling (in case of finite η a vortex creates a domain wall which makes its energy per unit length divergent in infinite sample...* **Response for B)**: The effect that even in a presence of finite Josephson coupling there is a length scale where the BKT transition-like crossover can be observed is also mentioned briefly in conclusion though conditions for disappearance of the BKT transition were not discussed because the case for finite- η was reserved for a separate paper (second paper cited as Ref.[13] in [1]): *Moreover the BKT transition in a system of these vortices should be observable even in a type-I system both in the limits $\eta = 0$, and when η is large, where one has sine-Gordon vortices interacting with a linear potential [13] (in the later case we apparently speak about a finite size crossover)*. Here we stress that Josephson coupling is a singular perturbation any amount of it eliminates a true BKT transition, a question of the observation of finite size-crossovers in an experiment is more complicated than what was assumed in [3] and depends on type of experimental probe and requires stricter criteria. Because we do not consider finite-size crossovers of much interest, this question will not be detailed here.

A remark on the point i in the comment: As mentioned above in the paper [1] we considered different lim-

its, in particular solutions for vortex in a general case of zero Josephson coupling, also there was given a criterion $L < \Lambda$ when in a general system (whether it is a superconductor or layered system) Josephson coupling can be neglected in the whole sample (where L is the sample dimension and Λ is the Josephson length). This sort of criteria is indeed applicable to a sample which is large compared to other length scales in the problem. Systems where it is the case were listed before going to this limit in [1] with no MgB_2 mentioned in the list.

Also indeed [1] does not feature absurd statements that coherence, penetration and Josephson lengths “can be chosen arbitrarily for every superconductor” and that “one can fit vortices in sample smaller than coherence length” which were attributed in the Comment to [1] for unclear reasons.

We note that indeed [1] was not a phenomenological study of MgB_2 in any respect, rather oppositely: albeit essential physics of the Josephson coupled superconductivity discussed in [1] applies to MgB_2 , it is in fact one of the least interesting applications of the questions discussed in [1]. We also remark that in recent years there appeared more physical systems which were proposed either to be two-gap superconductors or nonsuperconducting systems where $U(1) \times U(1)$ symmetry appears as an effective description [8].

In the Comment it is also claimed that the BKT transition physics in [1, 2] is “well established” and experimentally observed in layered systems [5, 6]. First the similarities with layered system physics were discussed in [1, 2], second the differences between layered (spatially separated) condensates and two-gap superconductors are apparent, for example the former case is not described by the extended Faddeev model in [1] because of the spatial separation. Third, the flux carried by a vortex in one layer in a system of N identical layers [5] is a function of layer thickness, penetration length and distance to surface. It should not be confused with the flux quantization in a general two-gap superconductors with arbitrary ratio of spatially nonseparated condensates given by eq. (5) in [1]. A more important circumstance is that the phase transition and the experimental probe in [6] have little to do with the transition considered in [1, 2]. That is, we did not consider a *superconducting* transition, our point was a separation of variables in general case and identification of a state with quasi-long-range order in phase difference which was discussed explicitly in [2]. In layered systems (connection to which was indeed made in [1, 2]) such a transition is related to dissipationless oppositely directed supercurrents belonging to two layers. For layered superconductors a proposal for concrete counterflow experiment and corresponding calculations were done only this year [?] and no experimental confirmation of this transition has been yet reported.

Regarding the criticism of the experimental paper by Festin et. al. The comment [3] also features

criticism of the experimental paper by Festin et.al. This discussion is also based on physically obvious errors and in part on attribution to [10] claims which were not made there. Festin et. al. never claimed that for Abrikosov vortices BKT-like crossover (not a transition indeed) cannot be observed but in fact they are the authors of a PRL paper where such a crossover was observed Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5567 (1999). In the cond-mat/0303337 the observation by Festin et. al. is different: they observed that a relative sharpness of crossover in very thick MgB_2 films was unexpectedly much narrower than that in much thinner $YBCO$ films which reasonably led to a possibility of very weakly coupled bands interpretation in [10]. Later other experiments and calculations gave opposite picture about which the authors of [10] were well informed long time ago. It should be noted that the measurements [10] were done much earlier than the publication of the eprint [10] and back then there was no consensus on interband coupling strength in MgB_2 and in particular there were reasons to expect it being very weak. Interband coupling can vary in a wide range and even can be either positive or negative. Microscopic origin of possibility of weak interband couplings in two-band system can be found in a number of publications including [7, 9]. Detailed discussion of vortex physics in MgB_2 can also be found in e.g. [9]

The claim in the Comment that if Abrikosov vortices have logarithmic interaction at some finite scale it results in a sharp BKT transition is also based on a physically obvious error: in a charged system a vortex has a finite-range interaction and finite energy. Therefore single vortices can be excited by thermal fluctuations and an existence of a certain scale of logarithmic interaction does not lead to a BKT transition. It is a well known exact result that that for one-component system with a gauged $U(1)$ symmetry there is no true sharp BKT transitions and no superfluid density jump. An existence of ill-defined BKT crossovers is indeed possible but that was not denied by Festin et. al. In fact, as mentioned above such questions were studied in their previous publications. Besides that Festin et. al. studied granular samples (which were essentially Josephson junctions arrays) and any serious discussion of the multiple peaks experiment [10] should take into account this circumstance first of all.

On a separate note we would like to remark on a question of observability of fractional flux in a situation of nonzero Josephson coupling. A very large ratio of the coherence length to the Josephson length noticed in [3] after substituting numbers from [7] to corresponding equations is an apparent consequence of being extremely close to T_c taking into account temperature dependence of Λ and ξ . This particular point not only does not adequately characterizes strength of interband coupling of any material in full range of temperatures but it also does not invalidate a possibility to observe split fractional vortices in principle. Besides BKT transitions there is a number of

other possibilities to induce vortices, one such a possibility is to exploit duality to Faddeev-Skyrme model which is robust against Josephson term perturbation and there are situations when Faddeev-Skyrme term can provide a repulsive force between two vortices with phase windings in only one order parameter (details can be found in Appendix)

Summary of points:

1. Gorokhov asserts that [1] is a study of MgB_2 and fractional vortices in the limit of zero or weak Josephson coupling. Answer: There were considered both limits of weak and strong and zero Josephson coupling in a general two-gap Ginzburg-Landau functional, it was shown that in strong Josephson coupling regime vortices are confined linearly. Examples of a range of systems with weak or zero Josephson coupling were given.

2. Albeit in [1] a phenomenological discussion of MgB_2 was not even attempted however moderate coupling limit considered in the paper is applicable to MgB_2 , in particular double-core integer flux vortices described in [1] were later observed in [4]. *Therefore potential applicability to MgB_2 mentioned in the abstract of [1] turned out to be correct.*

Appendix So the question is: if a Ginzburg-Landau model exists with a moderately strong Josephson term (e.g. just strong enough to forbid the BKT mechanism for thermal creation of pairs of fractional vortices), could it nonetheless possess fractional vortices as spatially separated topological excitations? The answer is positive: in our papers the variables were separated in general case and in we have shown in [11] that if to go beyond the London limit, two-gap superconductor has a self-induced Faddeev-Skyrme term, which counter-balances Josephson term in the circumstances discussed below: If we go beyond London limit and consider the order parameter $\vec{n}$ [11], we observe that the model also admits “baby” Skyrmions [12] which are topological defects of the $\mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow S^2$ map characterized by topological charge $\deg[\vec{n}] = 1/4\pi \int d^2x \vec{n} \cdot \partial_1 \vec{n} \times \partial_2 \vec{n}$. The addition of mass terms like the Josephson term $\rho^2 K n_1$ [1] is a necessary condition for the existence of stable baby skyrmions, which in the absence of mass terms for $\vec{n}$ diverges [12] (there is also a mass term for n_3 coming from Ginzburg-Landau potential [11]). Despite in terms of the variable $\vec{n}$, a baby Skyrmion is a coreless object, however the

situation is actually more complicated because the order parameter $\vec{n} = (\sin \theta \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2), \sin \theta \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_2), \cos \theta)$ is defined with the help of the angle θ given by: $|\Psi_{1,2}| = [\rho\sqrt{2m_1} \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}), \rho\sqrt{2m_2} \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})]$. Thus north and south poles of the order parameter space S^2 correspond to zero of the condensates $|\Psi_1|$ and $|\Psi_2|$ in physical space. Thus a baby skyrmion in two-gap superconductor makes physical space multiply connected and one must impose singlevaluedness condition: around zeroes of $|\Psi_{1,2}|$ the phases $\phi_{1,2}$ should change 2π times integer. In [13] we show that, for a defect with a given Hopf invariant, the winding of $(\phi_1 - \phi_2)$, specified by the Hopf invariant, is consistent with singlevaluedness conditions only when one has the following phase windings around these lines of zeroes: $(\Delta\phi_i = 2\pi, \Delta\phi_j = 0)$. This condition leads to a nontrivial configuration of the field $\vec{C}$ [13]; *thus in a baby Skyrmion of $\mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow S^2$ map, preimages of north and south poles of S^2 are the fractional vortices.* So, a baby Skyrmion in a TGS, in a simplest case emits two fractional vortices like that considered in [1]. These fractional vortices attract each other; however the attraction is counterbalanced by the Faddeev-Skyrme term which provides a repulsive force [11].

-
- [1] E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 067001 (2002).
 - [2] E. Babaev Nucl.Phys. **B686** 397(2004) [cond-mat/0201547]
 - [3] D. Gorokhov, cond-mat/0502083.
 - [4] M.Eskilsen *et.al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 187003 (2002)
 - [5] J. R. Clem, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 7837 (1991).
 - [6] S. N. Artemenko *et al.*, JETP Lett. **49**, 654 (1989).
 - [7] A. Gurevich, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 184515 (2003).
 - [8] Y. Matsunaga, M. Ichioka, and K. Machida Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 157001 (2004), H. G. Luo, T. Xiang Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 027001 (2005), O. Motrunich and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 075104 (2004).
 - [9] M. E. Zhitomirsky, V.-H. Dao Phys. Rev. **B 69**, 054508 (2004)
 - [10] Orjan Festin, Peter Svedlindh, W.N. Kang, Eun-Mi Choi, Sung-Ik Lee cond-mat/0303337
 - [11] Egor Babaev, Ludvig D. Faddeev, Antti J. Niemi Phys.Rev. B **65** (2002) 100512
 - [12] B. Piette *et. al.* Nucl. Phys. **B 439** 204 (1995)
 - [13] to be published.